DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 301 236 JC 880 525

AUTHOR Grissom, Grant R.; McMurphy, Suzanne
TITLE College-Correctional Collaboration in the Treatment of Juvenile Offenders: Evaluation of a Program Model in Six Sites. Final Report.
INSTITUTION University City Science Center, Philadelphia, PA. Criminal Justice Inst.
SPONS AGENCY New Jersey State Dept. of Higher Education, Trenton.
PUB DATE 13 Jun 86
NOTE 83p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; Cooperative Programs; *Correctional Education; *Delinquent Rehabilitation; *Institutional Cooperation; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Rehabilitation Programs; Two Year Colleges; Youth Problems

ABSTRACT

Since 1984, several New Jersey community colleges have become involved in providing treatment services and basic skills and vocational training to juvenile offenders. An evaluation of programs at six of these sites involved the collection of test data on students' basic skills, staff ratings of students' attitudes and behaviors, the administration of a confidential questionnaire to students concerning their experience with computer-assisted instruction, on-site observations, and interviews with college and corrections staff and students. Study findings, based on data on 104 juvenile offenders/students, included the following: (1) students showed strong gains in both math and verbal skills; (2) over 80% learned to use computers effectively and responded very positively to them; (3) college involvement contributed to the youths' self-image and helped to neutralize the effects of labeling; (4) though quantitative data on the effectiveness of vocational education were not available, most programs seemed to help students develop good work habits and favorable attitudes toward employment; (5) the programs had a positive impact on attitudes toward learning; and (6) behavioral changes were consistently positive, but generally modest. Information on the programs at each site, discussions of funding and follow-up, and survey instruments are included with the report. (AJL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED301236

COLLEGE-CORRECTIONAL COLLABORATION IN THE TREATMENT OF JUVENILE OFFENDERS: EVALUATION OF A PROGRAM MODEL IN SIX SITES

Final Report

University City Science Center
3624 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104
(215) 387-2255

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. Grissom

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

JC 880 525

COLLEGE-CORRECTIONAL COLLABORATION IN THE TREATMENT OF JUVENILE OFFENDERS: EVALUATION OF A PROGRAM MODEL IN SIX SITES

Final Report

Submitted to

NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION

By

Grant R. Grissom, Ph.D.

and

Suzanne McMurphy, MSS, MLSP

of the

Criminal Justice Institute

UNIVERSITY CITY SCIENCE CENTER
3624 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104
(215) 387-2255

June 13, 1986

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EVALUATION PROJECT SENIOR STAFF

Grant R. Grissom

Dr. Grissom is the Director of the Criminal Justice Institute at the University City Science Center in Philadelphia. A member of Phi Beta Kappa, he has earned degrees in mathematics (B.S.), computer science (M.S.) and counseling psychology (Ph.D.). His experience in the criminal justice field includes two years as a cottage supervisor in a residential juvenile correctional institution. Since joining the Science Center as a senior research associate in 1977, Dr. Grissom has directed more than a dozen evaluation research projects in the adult and juvenile justice systems under funding from the National Institute on Corrections, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, the National Institute of Justice, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and several local government agencies. He has also designed and/or directed research for the Office of Naval Research, the Army Research Institute, the National Institute on Drug Abuse, the National Institute on Alcoholism and Alcohol Abuse, and the National Institute of Education. Currently, Dr. Grissom is completing a book on his 10 year longitudinal research at Pennsylvania's Glen Mills Schools, the oldest juvenile correctional institution in the United States. This work represents the most extensive research ever conducted at a juvenile correctional institution in this country.

Suzanne M. McMurphy

Ms. McMurphy served as the Project Manager for the JTPA evaluation while on staff at the Criminal Justice Institute. She is currently a doctoral candidate at Bryn Mawr College Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research in Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania. She holds a master's degree in Social Work and a master's in Law and Social Policy. Originally a native of Michigan, Suzanne monitored Youth Projects under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. Her previous research projects include management of an on-going project to assess the differences between the ability of men and women to parent their children while in prison; development and analysis of a longitudinal data base of boys admitted to Glen Mills Schools for Boys; analysis of the Federal Investigation Strike Team (FIST) data base; and numerous efficiency evaluations of police and fire services. She is currently a teaching assistant in Statistics and Research Methodology, and a computer specialist at Bryn Mawr College Graduate School of Social Work.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents findings of an evaluation of a program model featuring collaboration of community colleges with juvenile correctional programs in providing basic skills, vocational training and treatment services to juvenile offenders. Program goals were to improve students' math and verbal skills; create a more favorable attitude toward work and learning; and to teach meaningful job skills.

Data were collected for 104 students at six sites. Findings and recommendations are based upon

- analysis of staff rating and basic skills testing data;
- students responses to a confidential questionnaire;
- on-site observations by evaluators;
- individual interviews with college and correctional staff members and students.

Major Findings

1. Students showed strong gains in both math and verbal skills. Their rate of improvement in these areas was double and triple (respectively) their rate of growth prior to entering the program.
2. A solid majority (i.e. over 80%) of the students learn to use computers effectively and respond very positively to them. Success in computer-aided instruction (CAI) is statistically associated with positive behavioral changes, suggesting that the CAI contribution to rehabilitation may extend beyond the acquisition of basic skills.
3. Involvement by the community colleges contributes to the youths' self image and helps to neutralize the effects of labeling. Benefits are

greatest when classes are conducted on the college campus. Student's behavior on campus was praised by both college and correctional staff.

4. Quantitative data were not available to support a finding with regard to the effectiveness of vocational instruction. Observation and interviews suggest that most programs helped students develop good work habits and favorable attitudes toward employment.
5. The programs had positive impact upon students' attitudes toward learning.
6. Behavioral changes, as measured by staff ratings, were consistently positive but generally modest. Substantial gains were made in impulse control; readiness to accept responsibility for oneself; and diminished tendency to portray oneself as a victim.

Conclusions/Recommendations

1. Computer-aided instruction is a highly effective and rehabilitative approach to basic skills instruction for delinquent offenders.
2. Smaller correctional programs benefit from the model primarily due to the specialized instructional expertise and programmatic diversification the collaboration provides. Boys in larger institutions benefit primarily from the normalization experience of attending classes on a college campus, neutralizing some of the effects of the "delinquency" label.
3. Overall program impact upon basic skills and self-esteem is strong and positive. Students developed sound work habits. Behavioral impacts were generally positive but modest.

4. Further development of the program model should focus upon

   a) expansion of the role of the college

   b) further development and refinement of the vocational training component

   c) development of a follow-up procedure to provide for an appropriate and smooth transition from the program to the home community and insure continuation of necessary services.

5. The program model has demonstrated significant positive effects and the potential for even stronger results if the issues raised in (4) above are addressed. Continuation and further development of the model is strongly recommended. Alternative funding mechanisms should be identified to supplement JTPA support.

The combination of improved basic skills, mastery of the computer and college involvement provides a potent boost to the students' self esteem and self concept. In the words of one boy: "I was scared of the computer at first. Now I have my own computer disk at the college and they let me use the computer during lunch! When I told my friends at home, they didn't believe me, but I showed them. My teacher said that if I keep improving like I have been I might be able to get into the community college after I leave here." From delinquent to aspiring college student: not a typical case, but an indication of the potential power of this model to change lives.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Evaluation Goals and Objectives 11

Evaluation Design and Methodology 12

Sample 13
Methodology and Instrumentation 13

Findings 17

The Program Model 17
College-Correctional Collaboration 19
Characteristics of the Sample 20
Strength of Treatment 22
Program Impact upon Basic Skills Aquisition 25
Program Impact upon Vocational Skills Acquisition 27
Program Impact upon Students' Behavior 28

Discussion

Benefits to Juvenile Offenders 31
Costs and Benefits to the Correctional Programs 38
Benefits to the Colleges 39
Implications for Alternative Schools 41
Further Development of the Program Model 42
Selecting the Basic Skills or Vocational Instructor 42
The Role of the College 45
Lessons from the Field 46

Issues: Funding and Follow-up 50

Funding 51

Follow-up 56

Tables and Appendices

Table 1: Site Characteristics 9
Table 2: Students' Assessment of the Treatment Environment 24
Table 3: Staff Ratings of Behavioral Impact 30

Appendix A: Persons Interviewed for the Evaluation
B: Evaluation Data Sheet
C: Staff Rating Form
D: Discharge Rating Form
E: Student Questionnaire
F: Youth Employment Competency Work Sheet
G: References

INTRODUCTION

The Criminal Justice Institute of the University City Science Center is pleased to present this evaluation report to the New Jersey Department of Higher Education. The report presents the findings of an evaluation of a unique program model for the rehabilitation of youthful offenders, involving collaboration between community colleges and juvenile correctional institutions.

BACKGROUND

During 1984 officials of the New Jersey Departments of Higher Education and Corrections saw in the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) an opportunity to improve the services available to the State's juvenile offenders while simultaneously strengthening the continuing education programs of community colleges. With the encouragement and support of these Departments, several community colleges established relationships with nearby juvenile correctional programs and submitted joint proposals to the Private Industry Councils (PIC) of their Service Delivery Areas (SDA). The proposals requested JTPA funding support for a variety of instructional services to be provided by the community colleges to juvenile offenders. Six applications were successful; these programs are the focus of this evaluation:

EVALUATION SITES

Juvenile Corrrectional Program	Community College	SDA
Jamesburg	Middlesex	Middlesex
Manorwoods	Atlantic C.C. and Stockton State College	Atlantic county/ Cape May
Oceanfields	Ocean	Ocean
Probationfields	Passaic County	Passaic
Sandy Hook	Brookdale	Monmounth
Skillman	Somerset	Somerset/Hunterdon

The following are summaries of the original JTPA proposals and the post-award program modifications at the six sites.

Sandy Hook

The program at Sandy Hook, in conjunction with Brookdale Community College, provides students with basic skills and office skills instruction, computer instruction and construction trades. The total budget is $158,151; the most significant items include: personnel $15,619 from JTPA and $33,333 from the Department of Corrections, computer instruction $50,000 and construction materials $14,583. The students receive 10 hours of theory a week plus 20 hours of hands on experience. In addition students participate in two hours of basic skills training and four hours of hands-on computer experience. Throughout the length of their stay students receive 12-16 hours of career assessment.

The construction training involves the restoration of the historic public buildings at Sandy Hook residential facility Monmouth Battlefield sites. The on-going assignments revolve directly around the development of carpentry

skills. Originally, the contract included a unit on blueprint reading and drafting, however this unit was eventually dropped in favor of increasing the construction trades course. A further change in this program was the decision to hold the basic skills and office skills classes at the Sandy Hook facility rather than the Brookdale Community College as originally planned. The length of the commute (40 minutes each way) was the key factor in the decision.

A third change in the program involved the position of Job Preparation coordinator, whose duties were a duplication of the existing basic skills instructor at Sandy Hook. The coordinator's dutes were changed to an administrative statistical role with the PIC staff.

Skillman

The total budget for the Skillman and Somerset County College program was $101,821. Students were to receive instruction in an introductory data entry computer programming course for a total of 90 hours.

As originally planned a mobile van, equipped with five computers, would travel between Vorhees, Highfields and Skillman programs. When the Highfields program was forced to move to the Skillman facility, the decision was made to install computers on Skillman's grounds.

Skillman also participated in the Twilight Tech program which was available to their younger residents, as the computer course was available only to those 16 and older. When the contract was up for renewal PIC decided it would not support Skillman's participation in two JTPA programs and the decision was made to move the computer aided instruction to a local vocational education program, terminating the program at Skillman.

Jamesburg

The program at Middlesex County College supported participation from both Jamesburg Training School and Middlesex County Day Care Program. The total match from these two programs was $96,747 and exceeded the 100% match required. The program originally consisted of three introductory components in basic electricity, plans and blueprint reading and basic hydraulics. Upon completion of these modules the student could specialize in lift truck machanics, maintenance mechanics or electro/mechanical drafting. The final program dropped plans and blueprint reading and focused on warehouse support and electronics as these areas provided the greatest potential job opportunities for the graduates. This program has now come to completion after having been refunded through fall of 1985.

Probationfields

This program is a community-based non-residential day program for youth who are in risk of being removed from their homes and includes both juveniles on probation who are court-ordered and those who voluntarily participate in the program. This project in conjunction with Passaic County College, is designed to serve 20 youth every six months. This is also the only program which has control over participant selection. Criteria include: age of 16-18 years, male, either unemployed or underemployed, high school dropout or potential dropout, and have a minimum of a 5th grade reading level. Excluded are individuals with severe drug or alcohol problems, severe emotional problems, violent sex offenders and indications of assaultive behavior. Once admitted, students are tested to determine which vocational program to participate in. Those scoring highest have the option of participating in the electronics program; those scoring lower are placed in the culinary arts program. Students receive approximately 300 hours of hands-on vocational

training and 220 hours of apprenticeship. Students also recieve 200 hours of basic skills training using computer aided instruction.

Manor Woods

The program at Manor woods, in cooperation with Atlantic Community College, provides students with 100 hours of computer aided instruction in basic skills and 100 hours of skill development with the computer in areas of programming, data processing and other education. The original budget of $90,451 provided for the purchase of hardware and software totalling $44,592. The current program has not changed from the original proposal except in expansion of the available skill development with the addition of new software.

Oceanfields

This program is one of the two whose training in computer aided instruction is done on a college campus. Oceanfields boys commute to Ocean County College; Jamesburg boys to Middlesex. The original budget for this program was $66,655 with the majority of the funding used for equipment and supplies, which include the microcomputers and software, totaling $31,890. The students receive training in basic skills, business applications, and other software applications. This program has also remained the same as specified in the original proposal.

The six programs are dissimilar in many respects, but they share a common treatment approach reflecting the needs of socialized (i.e. no psychopathology or serious emotional disturbance) juvenile offenders. A fundamental tenet of the approach is that those youths, like their non-delinquent peers, have a strong need for peer acceptance and social status. Their delinquency reflects an inability to meet these needs through socially acceptable behavior.

Delinquent youth, as a group, differ from their non-delinquent peers in several ways. Two important areas of difference include:

1. **Basic skills.** Delinquent youth are frequently deficient in both math and verbal skills, relative to their non-delinquent age-mates.
2. **Vocational skills and work habits.** Delinquents typically possess neither the skills nor the work habits which are needed for entry into the job market.

Basic skills deficits are the norm in delinquent subgroups. Academic failures, these youths find it very difficult to gain respect from peers who are more attuned to school achievement. Further, many school systems effectively block any socially acceptable avenues to status by excluding these youths from sports or other extracurricular activities because of their poor performance in class. Unable to achieve positive attention and recognition, many turn to delinquent groups which provide a feeling of belonging and acceptance, and an opportunity to achieve status through aggressive, "street wise", and frequently anti-social behavior. Lacking vocational skills, basic reading and math competencies, and interpersonal skills essential to the world of work, even those who might wish to find legitimate employment have little hope of succeeding. For many of these juvenile delinquency will beget adult criminality.

If we exclude the relatively small percentage of delinquents who through abuse or psychological disturbance have become sociopathic, we find that the majority of delinquents are surprisingly similar to their law abiding peers. A basic desire is the need for acceptance and respect: adolescent behavior, whether law abiding or delinquent, is powerfully influenced by peer pressures. Within a delinquent subculture, peer pressures reinforce anti-social behavior while undermining the values of the broader society.

This understanding of the etiology of delinquency suggests that, for these "socialized" delinquents whose behavior reflects peer group pressures rather than psychological disturbance, an appropriate intervention should include:

- training in math and verbal skills
- vocational education
- a treatment modality which harnesses peer group pressures to reinforce pro-social behavior rather than delinquent behavior.

All JTPA-supported correctional programs include these components. Training in math and verbal skills is accomplished through a combination of traditional classroom teaching and computer aided instruction. The content of the vocational curriculum varies widely among the sites, but the primary objective in all cases is to help the student develop positive work habits and attitudes while mastering the fundamental skills required for entry level employment in a trade. The treatment component, guided group interaction, involves a small group (i.e. 8-12 members) process designed to achieve favorable change in the youths' behavior and self-concept through the operation of pro-social peer norms within the treatment group.

Beyond these similarities in their core programs, there are wide differences among the sites. The four smaller sites--Manor Woods, Oceanfields, Probationfields and Sandy Hook--feature very different settings. Manor Woods is a large, old mansion-style home with a columned porch on the edge of a state park. Oceanfields is a modern dormitory-style institutional structure located on a state game farm. Probationfields is housed in a converted convent in an urban area. Sandy Hook is located in a historic site administered by the Coast Guard on the Atlantic shore. Both Skillman and

Jamesburg are large institutions designed as correctional facilitites, with Skillman the more modern of the two.

Table 1 presents several site characteristics. Important differences include:

1. **Size of the site.** The number of youths range from 20-30 at the four smaller sites to several hundred at Skillman and Jamesburg.
2. **Residential/Non-Residential.** Probationfields (Passaic) is non-residential. The remaining programs are residential.
3. **Legal status of residents.** Probationfields serves only youths placed on juvenile probation. Jamesburg serves only "inmates" subject to the jurisdiction of the parole board. Most other sites host a mixture of probationers and inmates.
4. **Vocational component.** The sites vary widely with respect to the type of training offered. Included are construction trades, electronics, warehousing, forklift truck operation and maintenance, culinary arts, game farm operation, and word processing.
5. **Age of residents.** Some sites have residents as young as thirteen. Jamesburg's population is largely in the 16-18 age bracket, and includes several adult offenders.
6. **Site security.** Minimal at most of the smaller sites, moderate at Skillman and very evident at Jamesburg, where custodial staff are uniformed corrections officers.
7. **Sex of residents.** The Skillman program includes boys and girls. Residents at the other sites are all males.
8. **Seriousness of offense.** Jamesburg residents include many serious and/or violent offenders. Probationfields students are all minor offenders. The other sites serve youths whose offenses are more serious than Probationfields' but less serious than Jamesburg's.

TABLE 1

SITE CHARACTERISTICS

PROGRAMS	CAPACITY	AVERAGE DAILY POPULATION 1985	AVERAGE AGE	AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY	STAFF
JAMESBURG	425	320	17½	13 mos.	-
MANOR WOODS	25	24	15	4-6 mos.	20
OCEANFIELDS	30	28	16½	6-8 mos.	15
PROBATIONFIELDS	20	16-18	16-18	4½-6 mos.	12
SANDY HOOK	30	30	16½	5-7 mos.	18
SKILLMAN	204	204	15½	13 mos.	240

9. **Selectivity.** At Jamesburg and Skillman, staff select JTPA participants. All other sites provide JTPA programs to the entire population.

These differences afford an opportunity to assess the effectiveness of the basic program model and college-corrections collaboration in a wide variety of operational settings.

EVALUATION GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The evaluation includes both process and impact components. The process goal is to describe the program model; key objectives here are to determine:

- the organization and program components of the juvenile correctional sites;
- the integration of the correctional programs with the JTPA-supported services provided by the community colleges.

The impact evaluation examines the effects of the program model upon the colleges, the correctional programs and the students. Core questions include:

- What are the positive and adverse consequences of the model experienced by the colleges?
- What are the positive and adverse consequences experienced by the correctional programs?
- What are the effects upon the students in terms of
  - academic and vocational skills acquisition?
  - attitudes toward work and learning?
  - changes in destructive or anti-social behavior patterns?

The evaluation did not attempt to compare the program model with alternative models (i.e. approaches stressing individual counseling; behavior modification; custody; or community/family involvement) for the rehabilitation of delinquents. Also, a plan to compare JTPA program participants to a matched comparison group of non-participants at one site (Skillman) was abandoned when JTPA funding for the site was unexpectedly terminated by the area Private Industries Council. None of the other five sites included statistically adequate samples of participants and non-participants to support the required comparisons.

EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The evaluation design consists, in effect, of six replications of a one group pretest-posttest design (Campbell and Stanley, 1966). The design requires testing of subjects prior to exposure to the program model and again after completing the program. Quantitative measures included:

1. basic skills (math and verbal ability), and
2. staff ratings of the boys' attitudes and behavior.

These data were collected for each boy upon admission to the program and at discharge.

This design is frequently employed where true experimental designs, involving random assignment of subjects to experimental and control groups, are not feasible. Relative to experimental designs the pretest-posttest design suffers from several weaknesses, making it difficult to unequivocally attribute test score changes to the boys' program involvement. For instance, improved scores might reflect specific events other than program participation which occurred between the first and second testings, or simple maturation.

The evaluation design employs a form of "multiple operationism" to overcome the weaknesses of the pretest-posttest model. Specifically, the program model is evaluated in six distinct operational configurations and from numerous perspectives. Within each site, interview and/or quantitative data were collected from college and correctional program administrators, staff and the students themselves. These varied data and information sources provide checks and balances; a network of touchpoints for the development of conclusions and recommendations.

In the four smaller sites all students participated in the JTPA programs, making it impossible to construct a comparison group of non-JTPA students.

Comparison groups were selected at Skillman and Jamesburg which would have enabled the evaluators to compare outcomes for boys who participated in the JTPA programs with outcomes for a matched sample of boys from the same institution who did not participate. However, the premature termination of JTPA funding for the Skillman program made it impossible to collect the relevant data, and the size of the JTPA group at Jamesburg (N = 6) proved too small to support the required analyses. An offer by the Division of Youth Services to provide comparison data from other (i.e. non-JTPA) sites was refused due to the wide variation between sites and the consequent problem of separating out JTPA program effects from those caused by site differences.

Absent a true experimental approach, the combination of on-site observation with a wide range of interview and quantitative data provides the strongest possible design. Confidence can be placed in conclusions which are consistent with so wide a range of data and perspectives.

Sample

The evaluation sample for Manor Woods, Oceanfields, Probationfields and Sandy Hook consisted of all boys admitted to each of those programs between March 1 and November 1, 1985. For Jamesburg the sample included all boys assigned to JTPA-supported training between March and August, 1985. At Skillman the sample consisted of the first 20 boys assigned to computer aided instruction after March 1, 1985 who met the JTPA elligibility requirements. JTPA funding was discontinued at Skillman in March 1985 but the program was picked up under the Division of Youth Services budget.

Methodology and Instrumentation

Evaluation methods included observation; semi-structured interviews; and the collection of quantitative data through basic skills testing, behavioral

ratings of students by program staff, and students' assessments of their experience.

Observation. Both the project director and the principal investigator visited each site on at least three separate occasions. They observed the full range of daytime program activities--vocational training, basic skills instruction, GGI, meals and recreation. Impressions and questions which arose from direct observation were discussed during interviews with program directors, staff and students.

Interviews. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with:

- Directors of the juvenile correctional programs
- Community college program coordinators
- Basic skills instructors
- Vocational training instructors
- Counselors/GGI facilitators
- Students
- Job development specialist
- Private Industries Council staff
- Service Delivery Area staff.

A list of interviewees is provided in appendix A. Interview questions varied depending upon the role of the interviewee. Major topics covered included program structure and operation; implementation issues; program benefits; unanticipated problems or obstacles; and suggestions for strengthening the program model.

Quantitative Data Collection. Quantitative data were collected for each student, including basic skills testing; demographic and program participation information; attitudinal and behavior ratings:

- Basic Skills. Testing for math and reading ability was completed for most students within two weeks of intake and again at discharge. The difference between the discharge and intake scores was divided by the number of months between testings to compute a measure of each student's rate of growth.
- Demographic and Program Participation Data. These data were collected primarily from court case records and program files. The 33 data elements collected for each student included background (e.g. age, race), offense history (e.g. type of offense, previous institutionalizations), and program involvement (e.g. length of stay, types of activities) information. The worksheet used to collect these data is provided in Appendix B.
- Student Rating Form. Staff ratings of each student's attitudes and behavior were collected using the form provided in Appendix C. Each student was rated by the staff member most familiar with his recent behavior. Ratings were completed during the student's third or fourth week (behavior during the initial two weeks is often atypical) and again at discharge. The latter rating was completed prior to notification of the student that he will be dicharged, since this often affects behavior. Change scores, the difference between the intake and discharge ratings, provided a measure of program impact upon each student's attitudes and behavior.

- Discharge Rating. Completed by the staff member most familiar with the student's progress, this form (Appendix D) provides a direct measure of staff perception of program impact.
- Student Questionnaire. This form (Appendix E) is completed by each student on a confidential basis, immediately prior to discharge. The student provides his assessment of various program components and the program's overall impact upon him. He returns the form directly to the evaluator in a sealed envelope; it is never seen by program staff.

Finally, quantitative data were available in the form of basic skills scores for students who had been committed to Oceanfields prior to the establishment of the JTPA-funded college collaborations. These data enabled the evaluators to identify trends in scores and any changes that could be attributed to the new programs.

All quantitative data were collected by program staff and forwarded to the Criminal Justice Institute for analysis. The various data collection forms were developed by the evaluators after an initial visit to each juvenile program site. Program staff were trained in the use of the forms during a second site visit.

FINDINGS

Data were available for a total of 104 students who participated in JTPA programs:

Jamesburg	6
Manor Woods	24
Oceanfields	22
Probationfields	14
Sandy Hook	24
Skillman	14

Quantitative results reported below are based upon analyses of data from this sample. An understanding of the program model was gained through interviews with college and correctional program staff.

The Program Model

As noted above, the six juvenile correctional facilities share a common treatment approach based upon the harnessing of peer group pressure to promote pro-social behavioral change. The four core program components are basic skills instruction, vocational training, group therapy using Guided Group Interaction (GGI), and recreation.

Treatment staff are trained to facilitate the development of pro-social norms in the GGI groups to insure that status can be obtained through positive behavior (educational or vocational achievement, helping one's peers, etc.) but never through intimidation or manipulation. Negative behavior such as failure to perform chores, inattention in class, rude or assaultive behavior, etc. are confronted and discussed during daily GGI meetings, typically lasting about an hour.

The treatment effect of the group-centered GGI approach extends beyond the group sessions themselves. Boys attend classes and participate in recreational activities in the company of their GGI group peers. The GGI group is the mechanism for providing recognition and support for positive behavior and challenging negative behavior at any time during the day. All permanent correctional program staff, including specialists such as teachers and vocational instructors, are trained in the use of the group process to achieve behavioral goals. For example, it is not unusual for a teacher to ask the group to deal with a disorderly student ("How do you feel about Tom's interruptions") rather than assume the role of disciplinarian. The subsequent peer confrontation is usually far more effective in changing the offender's behavior than adult authoritarianism, which in most cases has been tried and found ineffective on numerous occasions prior to the youth's institutionalization.

The integration of education, vocational training, etc. into the treatment process is further advanced by the periodic participation of teachers in the GGI sessions themselves. In the smaller sites, where staff perform multiple functions, the teacher or teacher's aide may also be a GGI facilitator. In either event, a student's behavior at any time during the day can become grist for the GGI mill. If the boy's peers fail to initiate the required discussion a staff person will do so.

The model requires extremely close working relationships among staff to insure that students are not able to manipulate adults to their advantage. In more traditional, individually-oriented treatment facilities it is not unusual for different types of staff (e.g. social workers, cottage staff, teachers) to bring very different value orientations and expectations to their work. The boys quickly learn to exploit these differences to gain

control. For example, professional staff who view the paraprofessional cottage workers as insufficiently sensitive to the emotional needs of the boys, or cottage staff who view the professionals as overly concerned with the youth's psychological needs and unconcerned with his behavior, are easy targets for boys to play off against each other while leaving their own value system untouched; status is achieved by manipulating the adult hierarchy to provide rewards ranging from extra cigarettes to weekend passes to discharge. In contrast, the GGI model requires a common understanding among staff of both behavioral norms and the role of peer pressure, as opposed to individual counseling, in achieving behavioral change.

In summary, the GGI group process is basic to all program activities. Teachers cannot be effective where students are inattentive or disorderly; vocational instructors cannot succeed where their charges are careless with tools and unable to accept supervision. These specialists rely upon peer pressures to insure behavioral norms appropriate to the instructional setting.

College-Correctional Collaboration. JTPA funding was used in the six sites to graft an additional basic skills or vocational training component onto the existing programs. While supported activities included several forms of vocational training and computer-aided basic skills instruction, which was offered in all sites except one (Jamesburg).

The specific form of the relationship between the correctional program and the community college varied considerably across sites. In some instances, the college instructor was appointed after only minimal consultation with the program director; in other cases the director made substantial input to the selection process. Some instructors conducted their classes at the correctional site, others at the community college. Some were

wholly integrated into the treatment team, others restricted their work to the classroom.

The potential benefits of the community college involvement were considerable, particularly for the smaller sites which could not afford to hire educational or vocational specialists. Beyond the direct benefits of improved basic skills and vocational performance, it was expected that students would feel increased self-esteem with an attendant reduction in negative behavior. The association with college instructors, mastery of a technology (the computer) which befuddles many adults, and significant gains in basic skills and vocational functioning were all expected to contribute to an improved self-image.

The data collection phase was designed to test these hypotheses; the interview and observation process to aid in the interpretation of the data and identify factors associated with implementational strengths and weaknesses. The remainder of this section presents quantitative results, which are discussed in the next section. The final section discusses policy issues relating to the continuation and strengthening of the programs.

Characteristics of the Sample

Youthful offenders differ in their treatment needs; a specific program model may be more effective with some types of offenders than with others. This section describes the sample of young men for whom evaluation data were collected. The evaluation sample consisted of 104 male students distributed across the six correctional programs. Background characteristics include:

Age: The average age of the boys in the sample was slightly over sixteeen years at the time of admission. Boys in Manor Woods and Skillman were somewhat younger; the Jamesburg boys older.

Race: Black 63% White 25% Hispanic 12%

Family Structure: Two-thirds (68%) of the boys came from a family headed by the mother. About one out of five (19%) came from a family with both parents present. Of the remainder, 7% lived with a relative, 3% with their father and 3% with a guardian.

Offense: About one-fourth (26%) were committed for a violent offense--rape, assault or robbery. Another one-fourth (28%) were charged with burglary. The remaining 46% were charged with a variety of other non-violent offenses.

Custodial Status: Two-thirds (65%) were inmates; one-third (35%) probationers. The latter category includes all 14 boys in the Probationfields sample.

Home Community: Two-thirds (65%) were from urban areas; one-fourth (25%) suburban and the remainder from rural areas.

Grade level at Intake: Reading: Median = 6.5; one-third were below a sixth grade reading level.

Math: Median = 6.7. One-third were below a sixth grade mathematics level.

Last Grade Completed:

1 through	6	9%
	7	12%
	8	16%
	9	39%
	10	14%
	11	7%
	12	3%

Age at First Offense:	6 through	12	23%
		13	12%
		14	24%
		15	24%
	16 through	18	17%

Peer Orientation: Less than one in five (19%) was a "loner" whose delinquency did not appear to be peer-influenced. The remainder were gang members or individuals who committed an offense in the company of his peers.

Previous Institutionalizations: One-third (32%) had been placed in an institution or group home prior to their current institutionalization.

Length of Stay: Length of stay varied widely across institutions, ranging from less than 4 months (Manor Woods) to 15 months (Skillman). The Oceanfields, Probationfields and Sandy Hook boys in the sample all had an average length of stay of 5.5 months.

Reason for Discharge: Three out of four (74%) successfully completed their program; 10% were transferred to another institution because of poor behavior. The remainder were AWOL or trasferred for reasons unrelated to their behavior.

Strength of Treatment

An important question bearing upon any impact evaluation is "How well implemented was the program model?" For example, failure to achieve desired results may be due to either an inappropriate treatment strategy, or an appropriate but poorly implemented approach. Success requires a well-conceived and well-implemented program.

The characteristics of a strongly implemented model encompassing computer-aided basic skills and vocational instructions, and GGI would include:

- Strong norms against aggressiveness and "conning".
- Strong norms supporting confrontation of negative behavior, fairness in student-staff interactions, and helping behavior.
- A challenging instructional program designed to elicit and maintain students' interest.

Data relating to these issues were obtained from students' responses to a confidential questionnaire. Responses are summarized in Table 2.

In general, these responses indicate that key norms relating to aggressiveness ("big and bad") and manipulation ("slick") are very strongly established. Staff are seen to be honest and fair by a solid majority. Computers receive an enthusiastic endorsement. Some weakness is evident in the apparent hesitancy to confront tough students: in response to another item, 29% reported that there was at least one instance when they were fearful that another student would hurt them. Also, slightly more than one student in four felt that students usually do not try to help each other. These latter areas leave room for improvement, but the most critical norms were established.

TABLE 2

STUDENTS' ASSESSMENT OF THE TREATMENT ENVIRONMENT

Item	Response Distribution			
	Not true	Usually not true	Usually true	Very true
You can get along fine in this program if you are "slick" and can con the staff	50%	40%	10%	-
Most students don't confront the toughest students in the group	25%	19%	37%	19%
You can trust the staff to be honest and fair with you	3%	10%	46%	41%
Most students here try to help each other to improve themselves	4%	22%	54%	19%
I liked working with the computers	4%	10%	23%	63%
School work here was more interesting than in other schools I've been in	21%	12%	29%	38%
The best way to make it in this program is to act big and bad	74%	19%	7%	-

Program Impact Upon Basic Skills Acquisition

Improvement in mathematics and verbal competencies was one of the core objectives of computer-aided instruction. Instructors' salaries, computer system hardware and a variety of educational software products were included in the JTPA budgets.

Data pertaining to basic skills acquisition were collected from four sources:

1. Interviews. All JTPA-supported instructors were asked to assess the role and impact of the computer in helping the boys to improve their school work.
2. Standardized testing for math and verbal competency was conducted at intake and discharge. Each student's intake scores were subtracted from his discharge scores and the result divided by the number of months in the program, yielding a measure of months of improvement for each month in the program.
3. Staff ratings of effectiveness of the computer in motivating the boys and helping them to improve their basic skills.
4. Students' responses to a confidential questionnaire.

Interview responses are discussed in a later section, but instructors and other program staff strongly supported the use of computer-aided instruction. Standardized testing indicated that, on average, students improved their math skills at a rate of 1.2 months for every month spent in the program. Forty percent achieved less than one month's growth in math skills for each month in the program and 40% achieved more than two months' growth per month. Average gains in verbal scores were 1.8 months per month in the program; with 30% improving at a rate below one month of growth per month and 45% achieving

at least two months' improvement in verbal scores for each month in the program.

Analyses pertaining to basic skills testing were based upon median improvement scores, which are not distorted by "outliers". An "outlier" is an improvement score which is artificially high due to uncharacteristically poor performance on the intake test. Some students, tested shortly after their admission to the program, are disoriented by the placement and devote little effort to the tests; thus their "improvement" as measured by the difference in performance at discharge appears very great and does not reflect true academic growth. For example, a few students showed more than a year's "growth" for each month in the program.

Basic skills testing data were available from Oceanfields for three years prior to the start of the JTPA-supported CAI program. Average monthly gains in mathematics increased from a 3-year average of 3.1 to an average gain of 3.7 (a 20% improvement) with the introduction of CAI. The improvement in the effectiveness of verbal skills instruction was even more dramatic, from a 3-year average of 1.8 before CAI to 3.7 (106% improvement) after CAI. These longitudinal trend data indicate a strong, positive impact of CAI upon basic skills acquisition.

Staff ratings of the effectiveness of the computer as a motivating device in academic achievement indicate that the computer was an important motivator for more than four out of five boys who used it; a "very important" factor for nearly one-third. The computer was rated as "ineffective" as a tool for basic skills acquisition for only 5% of the students; "somewhat effective" for 17% and "effective" or "very effective" for 78%.

Students' confidential, post-release ratings of their computer experience indicated the following reactions to the statement "I liked working with the computers":

Response	Percent
Not true	4%
Usually not true	10%
Usually true	13%
Very true	63%

In response to a second question more than two-thirds (68%) of the students felt that it was "usually" or "very" true that their school work was more interesting than in previous schools. These data are strongly consistent with evaluator's on-site observations and comments by students during informal, individual interviews. We conclude that the program impact upon basic skills was strong and positive, and that computer-aided instruction played an especially important instructional role.

Program Impact upon Vocational Skills Acquisition

At the time of the evaluation there were no standardized assessments available of vocational skills acquisition. Data relating to vocational skills is limited to program completion rates; staff assessments of boys' work habits; and the students' opinions regarding the usefulness of the training in finding a job.

Eighty-five percent of the JTPA students completed their programs' vocational training requirements. Staff rating of the extent to which the boys applied themselves to their vocational training and work assignments showed improvement (Mean rating at intake was 4.39 on a 7-point scale; dicharge rating = 4.57) over the course of the program. Finally, nearly two-thirds (62%) of the students felt that "The things I have learned here will help me to find and keep a good job someday". Of course, "the things I

have learned here" refer to the broader program; not solely the vocational component.

It is important to note that skills acquisition per se was a secondary goal even for the vocational component. Most of the boys were too young to have a realistic chance of finding skilled employment. The primary goal of training was improvement of work habits: punctuality, ability to accept supervision, teamwork, concern with product quality, etc.

Data are insufficient to support a strong finding in relation to the effectiveness of the vocational instruction. Observation and interviews suggest that most programs enjoyed at least modest success. Strengths and weaknesses of various vocational activities in relation to overall program goals are discussed below.

Program Impact upon Students' Behavior

An important program goal is the alteration of behaviors which are related to delinquency: aggressiveness, manipulativeness, impulsivity, resistance to legitimate authority, etc. Quantitative findings relating to behavioral change come from two sources, student and staff questionnaire responses.

Student perceptions of program impact include the data reported above indicating that most feel they are better equipped to find and keep a good job. A very solid majority (87%) also felt that the program helped them learn how to get along better with other people. Almost as many (84%) thought the program would help them to stay out of trouble in the future; and overall two-thirds felt that the program "helped a lot" while only 2% said it "didn't help at all".

Table 3 presents data from staff ratings at intake and discharge for items relating to key behaviors. Each rating is based upon a 7-point scale

of behavioral frequency; for each item the staff person was asked to compare the frequency of the boy's behavior with that of "most adolescents his age":

Rating Scale

1 = Rarely

2 = Much less than average

3 = Slightly less than average

4 = Average

5 = Slightly more than average

6 = Much more than average

7 = Very frequently

The change scores (i.e. the difference between the intake and discharge ratings) reflect the direction and extent of behavioral change over the course of the program. All changes were in a positive direction. The most improvement is shown in acceptance of responsibility for oneself; impulse control; and reduced tendency to portray oneself as a victim. These data indicate a modest but positive behavioral impact for the combined programs; and a high level of approval by students post-discharge.

TABLE 3

STAFF RATINGS OF BEHAVIORAL IMPACT

Item	Mean Intake Rating	Mean Discharge Rating	Change Score
Resists doing what is expected of him	3.9	3.7	.2
Intimidates other students	3.7	3.6	.1
Expresses anger in poorly controlled way	4.4	4.0	.4
Withdraws from involvement with other students	3.8	3.7	.1
Makes fun of others	3.8	3.7	.1
Acts impulsively	4.5	4.1	.4
Expresses depressed thoughts	3.8	3.6	.2
Holds other students accountable	4.1	4.3	.2
Accepts responsibility for self	3.5	4.1	.6
Respects adults	4.4	4.6	.2
Manipulative	4.3	4.3	-
Applies himself to studies	4.2	4.5	.3
Acts fearful of others	3.1	2.9	.2
Treats others' property with respect	4.3	4.4	.1
Portrays self as a victim	4.2	3.8	.4
Acts guarded or defensive	4.6	4.4	.2
"Slick"; tries to get away with things	4.5	4.3	.2
Confronts others appropriately	3.9	4.2	.3
Distrusts adults	4.1	3.9	.2
Paticipates in peer social activities	4.3	4.5	.2
Accepts program rules	4.1	4.4	.3
Takes confrontation seriously	4.1	4.4	.3
Accepts direction from staff	4.5	4.7	.2

DISCUSSION

In its broadest terms, this evaluation was designed to determine whether county colleges and juvenile correctional programs can collaborate effectively in the rehabilitation of juvenile offenders. Do the youths benefit? What are the costs and benefits to the correctional programs? The colleges? How can the programs be strengthened? This section discusses our findings based upon on-site observation, staff and student interviews, and the quantitative data presented in the preceding section.

Benefits to Juvenile Offenders

Interviews with staff and students and the data presented above yield a profile of the typical student served by the JTPA sites. First, he is an academic failure. Over sixteeen years of age, he should have completed the tenth grade but in fact is a year or more behind in school and functions on a sixth grade level in verbal and mathematics skills. He has invariably been assigned to the "slow" class; his teachers and peers have regarded him as stupid and a behavior problem. He has failed to achieve respect and status among achievement-oriented peers.

He has not fared much better among his delinquent age-mates. Most students in the four "fields" sites are relatively weak, "follower" types; strong and aggressive delinquents are typically assigned to Jamesburg or a more secure site. Having failed to achieve status in either delinquent or mainstream subcultures, his self image is poor.

He is not very cooperative. Having rejected the values of the system he feels has rejected him, very little of his behavior is constructive or helpful. Coming from a household without a father, many have absorbed the sense of powerlessness of the "charity case" welfare client.

Finally, he is very vulnerable. On top of all the other deficits, he will now have to cope with the label "delinquent". The stigma associated with that label will make it difficult for him to find employment or the reinforcement he will need to shake the loser image and self-concept.

If this young man is to break out of a downward spiral toward even more serious delinquency and, eventually, adult criminality he will need the tools to function in a law-abiding social system: basic math and literacy skills; marketable vocational skills and work habits; and sufficient self esteem to overcome the inevitable social hurdles concomitant with the "delinquent" label. To obtain these tools, he must be motivated to work hard in areas (e.g. schoolwork) where his consistent experience has been frustration and failure.

The failure of most rehabilitation programs is directly related to their failure to motivate the inmate to take full advantage of educational and treatment programs. Punitive approaches invariably fail, because they insure that the inmate social system will be cohesive and opposed to the mainstream values of the oppresive institution. Their products re-enter society confirmed in their delinquent identity, and with increased hostility. Individual, casework approaches are also highly likely to fail, since they rely heavily upon the inmate-caseworker relationships to achieve behavioral and/or personality change. This frequently leads to conflict between the professional caseworkers, whose primary concern is with his or her individual clients, and the paraprofessional cottage staff who are charged with maintenance of order and discipline and are therefore concerned with group behavior. Many delinquents are irresistibly tempted to use their considerable manipulation skills to exploit this staff conflict. Even where this can be avoided (e.g. many institutions have adopted a "team treatment"

approach to bridge the counselor-cottage worker gap and reduce staff conflict), there are enormous obstacles to effective casework in institutions. The delinquent frequently holds hostile or at least distrustful attitudes toward adult authority figures. He is not very verbal around adults and is disinclined to engage in the self-examination necessary to genuine insight, preferring to blame the rest of the world for his problems. Many times caseworkers subtly reinforce this view, since there is usually some truth to it and the caseworker tries to be emphathetic in an effort to establish a good relationship. Alternatively, the caseworker model risks reinforcing the boys' negative self concept by focusing on his "problems" and emphasizing his need for "help". Underneath all the surface acceptance comes the message "You are different. You are bad. I am normal. You need my help to change." Finally, and most significantly, the boy probably spends no more than an hour each week with his caseworker. The other 167 hours are spent with his peers who have brought their delinquent "street" norms and value system into the institution. They confer respect and status based upon a very different formula than that espoused by the caseworker. Which do you suppose will have the greater influence on the boys' behavior?

The treatment model adopted by the six JTPA sites takes an approach radically different from either the punitive or caseworker model. Recognizing that the behavior of the majority of delinquents is shaped by the same forces as that of non-delinquent adolescents, the GGI-based program harnesses peer group pressures to promote pro-social rather than delinquent behavior. Treatment staff do not focus their attention on helping individual students as much as on molding peer group norms, so that the peer group awards positive status and recognition for pro-social behavior (e.g. academic

achievement) and sanctions intimidation, "conning", and other forms of negative behavior. Thus a normative group climate conducive to learning is maintained, making it possible for educational and vocational instructors to teach.

The latter point is crucial to understanding why the college-correctional collaboration finds fertile soil in the GGI treatment model. Where class attendance is mandated and order maintained through the coercive power of correctional authorities, students experience the educational program as an extension of their former, unsuccessful educational history. Success is greeted with indifference or rejection from his peers. Most students do as little as possible to avoid punitive sanctions. Genuine investment in learning is rare, since it makes one an isolate in a delinquent subculture which values academic effort negatively. In contrast, successful GGI programs encourage involvement in classwork because the peer group explicitly recognizes and supports achievement. The group confronts those who are inattentive or disrespectful in class. This frees the instructor to devote his/her energies to teaching, rather than discipline. In short, the correctional program provides group norms conducive to learning, and the college instructors provide the course content.

The data presented above (Findings) strongly indicate that this model is extremely effective in providing for growth in basic skills. On average, students in the study sample had been in the public school system for ten years but demonstrated basic skills competencies appropriate to grade level 6.6. Thus, for each month of schooling they had achieved .66 months of growth prior to the JTPA experience. During their time in the program they achieved a growth rate of 1.20 for math skills and 1.80 for verbal skills, i.e. they doubled and tripled their former rate of growth for math and verbal

competency, respectively. The program can claim a clear success in terms of its effectiveness in basic skills instruction.

The evaluation team noted several other more subtle, but arguably equally important benefits to the students. Computer-aided instruction (CAI) provided the boys with a mastery experience wholly incompatible with a negative self-concept in relation to academics. Time and again we observed classrooms of students who took pride in their knowledge of computers. Equipment was well cared for; there was only one incident of deliberate misuse of a computer during the entire evaluation period, and that incident resulted in only minor damage. It was not unusual to find students continuing to work on the computers during their free time. One boy cried when he was prohibited from using the computer as a sanction for misbehavior in class.

The successful introduction of CAI is a tribute to the skill of the instructors. But it also suggests some inherent strengths of the computer as an instructional tool for use with juvenile offenders. First, it allows for individualized and self-paced instruction, an indispensable requisite where students having a broad range of ability must share the same classroom. Second, the computer is non-judgemental and infinitely patient; ideally suited for boys who have learned to expect criticism and an "I can't-do-anything-with-him" attitude.

Finally, the computer is a high technology device that few of the boy's law-abiding peers and even fewer of the adults in his life have mastered. It provides him an opportunity to be "one-up"; to help overcome the stigma of the "delinquent" label. One boy told us with obvious satisfaction how he had demonstrated his computer skills during a home pass to the astonishment of his high-achieving older brother and his pals.

Another area of benefit is the effect on the boys' self-image of receiving training from a college instructor. The closer the identification with the college, the more powerful the effect. The JTPA courses provided to Oceanfields students were conducted on the college campus; Manor Woods' students also had opportunitites to attent classes on campus as part of a separate summer program. Students, correctional staff and college personnel were unaminous in describing the boys' pride and model behavior. Staff noted that the boys always took extra time to groom themselves before the trip to campus. One student purchased an extra pair of sneakers which he wore only to campus. Evaluators observed a class held at Ocean County College, where the students were attentive and well mannered. College secretaries and administrators confirmed that this was the norm, that the Oceanfields students always dressed and behaved appropriately on campus. Finally, attending classes on campus raises the sights of some students who can realistically hope to attend college one day. Some have considerable potential which will never be realized unless they begin to see themselves as "college material".

The increased pride and improved self-image suggests a possible link between CAI, the college involvement and positive bahavioral change. Statistical analyses were conducted to examine the relationship between effective use of the computer and a variety of behavioral change measures. Positive, statistically significant relationships were found between mastery of the computer and

1. Reduced seeking out of adults for attention ($F=2.61$, $df=3$, $p < .06$)
2. Reduced teasing of other students ($F=2.94$, $df=3$, $p < .04$)
3. Increased acceptance of responsibility for own behavior ($F=3.11$, $df=3$, $p < .04$)

4. Increased respect for adults ($F=3.27$, $df=3$, $p < .03$)

5. Increased willingness to appropriately confront peers' negative behavior ($F=2.31$, $df=3$, $p < .09$)

The association between mastery of the computer and these behavioral changes does not necessarily mean that the mastery causes the improved behavior. It may be that both are due to some underlying personality trait or strength that some boys bring to the program. But these data are clearly consistent with the view, stated by numerous instructors and staff, that mastery of the computer leads to clear and significant improvement in self esteem which in turn results in more responsible, mature behavior.

To fully appreciate the impact upon students it is important to speak to the students themselves. Though anecdotal, their experiences place the hard data in a more human context. Some examples:

> "The computers make math fun. I was never good at it before. Now I help the new boys. You know, at first you don't want to try because you don't think you'll be able to learn it. It makes you feel good when you see that you can do it."

> "I was scared of the computer at first. Now I have my own computer disk at the college and they let me use the computer during lunch. When I told my friends at home, they didn't believe it, but I showed them. My teacher said that if I keep improving like I have been I might be able to get into the community college after I leave here."

> "You feel different when you're at the college, with all the nice buildings and all. I have a brother in college and I want to show my mother that I can get there too, even if I did wrong before."

> "Time goes real fast there (In the computer room)."

> "They make you feel different about yourself here. When I came I was lazy. And I didn't confront because I was affraid of being criticized myself. They teach you that a friend is someone who helps you to look at your problems, not someone who lets you slide and doesn't get involved."

Costs and Benefits to the Correctional Programs

Where college involvement was strong, correctional administrators were unanymous in acknowledging the benefits their programs derived from the collaboration. However, their satisfaction primarily reflected the dedication and competency of the college instructor, since the role of the college itself was quite limited in most instances. Potential extensions of the role of the colleges are discussed below.

There was considerable interaction between college and correctional staff in two programs, Oceanfields and Jamesburg. Both collaborations overcame very shaky beginings to establish solid programs. Funding for the program offered by Oceanfields and Ocean County College was delayed for months due to a series of miscommunications between Oceanfields, the College, the Private Industries Council and the Service Delivery Area staff. Once these initial hurdles were cleared, an effective program was established on the college campus. Current plans call for a creative integration of basic skills and vocational activities, involving students' use of computers to help manage and operate the game farm at Oceanfields. In the case of Jamesburg, initial vocational classes at Middlesex College were beset with a variety of problems (see below). Their successful resolution is a tribute to the commitment of the Jamesburg staff and the flexibility and responsiveness of the Middlesex instructors and administration.

Beyond these two cases, there was typically only minimal involvement of college staff other than the assigned instructors. The success of the programs is due in large measure to the skills and commitment of these individuals. For example, the CAI program at Skillman was so effective that, when their JTPA funding was unexpectedly terminated, Skillman purchased their own computers and hired the Somerset College instructor. The Skillman

administration feels that their current program is as effective as it was when Somerset was involved. This example illustrates that most of the JTPA programs have not fully exploited the potential benefits of their collaborations.

The primary benefit to the correctional programs was the expanded program offering made possible by the JTPA funding. This was particularly critical for the four smaller sites, since the larger populations in Skillman and Jamesburg already enabled them to offer a broad range of programs. Jamesburg, for example, has an extensive and well developed vocational training program. And since the JTPA training was conducted off grounds (at Middlesex County College), the security conscious facility was required to develop a screening process which sharply limited the number of eligible students. For them, the JTPA funding involved considerable administrative effort for a relatively small programmatic gain. The importance of Jamesburg's participation was in demonstrating that under proper controls, serious offenders could participate in and benefit from off-grounds programs.

The only significant "cost" reported by correctional administrators was the time required to plan for the integration of the JTPA activities into their existing programs. In one case (Sandy Hook) the time and expense involved in transporting students to the college campus (Brookdale) was thought to be excessive, and at the site's suggestion all instructional activities were moved to the Sandy Hook facility. Brookdale concurred in this decision. Sites encountered a variety of other implementation problems, mostly minor, which are discussed below.

Benefits to the Colleges

The evaluators felt that there was wide variation among the colleges

regarding their enthusiasm and commitment to the program. Middlesex and Ocean, which had hosted the JTPA classes on their campuses, were invested in doing everything possible to help the program succeed. At the other end of the spectrum, Somerset College had only minimal communication with Skillman before acquiesing in a PIC decision to cut off funding for Skillman in favor of Twilight Tech. Similarly, Probationfields ran their program virtually independently of Passaic County College until a change of administration at the college lead to greater interest in the program.

When asked about the benefits derived by the College from the collaborations with the correctional facilities, administrators invariably cited their mission to provide educational services to their communities as the most important incentive. Other benefits cited include:

- the use of JTPA funds to purchase needed equipment and software;
- the strengthening and extension of programs for the disadvantaged. Middlesex, for example, felt that they benefited from the experience of Jamesburg's instructors who had a long history of working with young men from disadvantaged backgrounds;
- some of the students showed good potential for enrollment following their discharge from the Division of Youth Services; to a limited extent the JTPA program served a recruiting function for the colleges;
- collaboration with the juvenile programs enabled the colleges to qualify for JTPA funding, since the Youth Services' contribution of staff salaries and transportation costs met the JTPA requirement for matching funds.

"Costs" of participation included overcoming some initial concerns about working with offenders. Some administrators feared the possibility of delinquent acting out on their campuses. An incident at Middlesex illustrates the danger. The relationship with Jamesburg was threatened when a young man, thought to be a Jamesburg student, exposed himself to a college staff person. Although an investigation determined that no Jamesburg student was involved, the classes were nonetheless moved to a different building which is relatively isolated on the fringe of the campus. As indicated above, fears of misbehavior have proved groundless and the youths have earned the praise of college and correctional staff for their behavior on campus.

Implications for Alternative Schools

The findings of this evaluation may be useful in the development or improvement of alternative schools for students whose behavior requires their removal from the regular public schools. Effective programming for this group would interrupt the downward spiral toward delinquency. It is reasonable to suppose that instructional strategies found effective in the JTPA correctional programs may be successful in alternative schools as well.

In general, our findings support the conclusions of two recent studies of effective inner-city schools. The Council for Basic Education in Washington, D.C. and Harvard University's "Search for Effective Schools" project both concluded that five ingredients are characteristic of effective urban schools:

1. Strong leadership from the principal
2. High expectations of all students
3. An orderly but non-rigid atmosphere
4. Emphasis upon basic skills

5. Frequent evaluation of students' progress

Our own observations and interviews strongly support this conclusion. The JTPA programs have demonstrated the usefulnes of computer-aided instruction in achieving (4) and (5). Involvement of the community colleges contributes strongly to the perception that students are capable of high levels of achievement and radically alters the self-perceptions of these students. Finally, our findings suggest that systematic manipulation of peer pressures, as in GGI, may be a sixth important component of effective programs, and the integration of vocational training, a seventh. The GGI model itself may be counter-indicated for non-residential programs since it relies heavily upon peer confrontation. Probationfields found, for example, that students were reluctant to confront their tougher peers for fear of retaliation outside the program. A cooperative relationship between the Department of Corrections' Division of Youth Services and local Boards of Education would enable the latter to benefit from the Division's considerable experience in modifying the GGI approach to meet local requirements, and integrating vocational and academic instructional components.

Further Development of the Program Model

Experience gained by the six pioneering programs will be helpful to their further development and to additional sites wishing to adopt the same model. Core issues include finding the most appropriate instructor and extending the role played by the college. This section examines these issues and makes recommendations based upon the developmental histories of the six JTPA sites.

Selecting the Basic Skills or Vocational Instructor. The selection process should involve both the correctional staff and the college administrators. The GGI treatment approach makes special demands upon all staff. The

requirements of teaching students with a history of poor academic performance within the context of a juvenile correctional program make certain instructor characteristics especially salient, even when the classes are conducted on a college campus.

Each instructor was asked to identify traits of special importance to their work in the JTPA program.

- Fast pace, high energy. Nearly all stressed the need to avoid "dead time" in classes, which can lead to fading attention and misbehavior.
- Organized; able to develop clear, realistic individualized goals and objectives. Each student should know exactly what is expected. Goals should be challenging, but achievable in short time frame to avoid unnecessary frustration.
- Flexibility and creativity; resourcefulness. Traditional instructional approaches have been ineffective with many of these students. Also, the situation requires great flexibility in interrupting classes when necessary to deal with issues left over from GGI sessions; and generally "go with the flow" in channeling students' energies rather than sticking rigidly to a lesson plan. It is essential that instructors have wide latitude in developing their curricula.
- Strong, assertive, not easily intimidated. Although classroom misbehavior is rare, it is important that the instructor be seen as capable of keeping control when incidents occur. However, a "tough guy" image is a liability, not an asset.
- Respectful of students. This is especially critical since most of the students in these programs are not leaders, but

weaker delinquents with relatively poor self images. The instructor must insist upon respect from the students as well; technical competence in the subject area is important.

- Willingness to extend involvement beyond the classroom. Particularly important are visits to the correctional facility to better understand the students' environment; occasional attendance at GGI sessions and correctional staff meetings; and attendance at program social events.
- Patience, encouragement. These traits are particularly important in relation to CAI. Most students are initially frustrated and feel inadequate when confronting a computer for the first time. Without proper encouragement and support, they easily give up.
- Willing to insist upon high standards of performance. Instructors were unanymous in feeling that the students were capable of far greater achievement than many adults realized. Even the correctional staff were astonished at the level of performance on the computers. Strong emphasis upon cognitive skills is clearly warranted, since the potential is great and the skills underdeveloped.
- Understanding of group process and dynamics. Ability to "read" group norms and status hierarchies is especially important in a GGI environment.

Clearly, not all instructors were equally strong in all areas, nor did they place the same value on all these traits. They seemed, however, to share an unusual enthusiasm for their subject; pride in the development of their students; a highly creative "let's-try-it-and-see-if-it-works" approach to

teaching; and strong commitment to their work. Mary Jane Wishart, the Atlantic Community College staff person assigned to Manor Woods, continued teaching there without pay for several months during an interruption of the JTPA funding for the site. Ms. Wishart is an extreme example of the high level of dedication shared by many of the JTPA staff.

The Role of the College. The potential contribution of the Community Colleges' continuing education programs to the rehabilitation of juvenile offenders is far greater than has been realized. The major role played by the six colleges involved developing a proposal, designing a curriculum and providing an instructor. The colleges have other resources and expertise to offer. Furthermore, identification with the college programs improves delinquents' self esteem and counteract some of the negative effects of labeling by the justice system. Efforts to strengthen this identification and take advantage of college expertise should be encouraged; the following are some suggestions made by program staff and administrators:

- Use of athletic and recreational facilitites. For example, the boys in the program might be invited to a swimming party in honor of their peers who successfully completed their courses or earned a GED.
- Selection of computers and software. Correctional program staff lack the expertise to choose among the many hardware and software options available.
- Loan of instructional equipment. Examples include devices used to measure vocational skills; videotape cameras for use with role play of job interviews.
- Development of program evaluation methodologies and instrumentation.

- Stage recognition/award ceremonies for program achievement.
- Opportunities for correctional staff to conduct workshops or seminars for college students.
- Involvement of college students as interns to the correctional programs. College students would bring technical expertise (e.g. in computers) as well as relationship opportunities to their work in the classroom with juvenile offenders.
- Provide scholarships for high achieving students who want to pursue a college education after their discharge.

In short, the six JTPA programs have demonstrated that college-correctional collaboration is a viable strategy which provides substantial benefits to both the students and the institutions. Creative ways must be found to build upon these initial successes.

Lessons from the Field. The following recommendations are based upon interviews with administrators and staff:

1. Conduct training for college instructors to alert them to the unique instructional requirements of the juvenile offender. The latter is not "abnormal" nor does he have "limited potential". However, he has experienced failure in traditional educational settings and may initially be resistent or intimidated, lacking the confidence that he can succeed. Training for instructors should include familiarization with GGI, the juvenile program site and staff. Ongoing communication is essential to effectiveness.
2. Develop a follow-up process linking discharged students to employment and training opportunities in their home counties. The lack of a follow-up mechanism is a major weakness of the current model; the problem is addressed further below.

3. Create alternative shools for "pre-delinquents" who are behavioral problems, using the model developed with the JTPA funding. There is every reason to expect that the combination of GGI, basic skills instruction using CAI, and vocational education would be as effective before the youth is labeled "delinquent". Probationfields, as a non-residential program for minor offenders, has demonstrated the feasibility of this approach. It is likely that this intervention would interrupt the progression toward delinquency while relieving the school system of disruptive students.

4. Observation and interviews indicate that the vocational training components are effective in helping students to develop positive attitudes toward work and appropriate work habits. Sites should develop formal, objective measures in this area. Other program enhancements which should be considered are:

   a) A method for assessing aptitude for various programs to insure that students are not inappropriately placed, and to monitor their progress.

   b) Establishment of programs which are as appropriate as possible to correctional goals. For example, activities which nurture pride of accomplishment (such as construction trades where one's peers, family, counselor, etc., can admire the result and functionality of one's work); or which involve giving something back to the community (such as the Sandy Hook work in restoring a historic site). Also, individual activities (e.g. electronics) are less appropriate to the GGI treatment

model than vocations requiring teamwork and cooperation.

c) Field trips to "real world" work setting would provide a frame of reference for the vocational training and, for more advanced students, give them a sense of accomplishment through their understanding of workplace jargon, procedures, equipment, etc.

d) More integration of "hands-on" activities into the formal training component.

e) Development of a "real world" work experience where program staff control the dynamics of the workplace. Currently, the transition from the program site (where there are no production pressures; no job competition; treatment support systems; a tolerance for errors caused by inexperience; etc.) to the job site is extremely difficult. This is particularly true where unemployment levels are high and job competition fierce--the lack of job experience and the arrest record are difficult handicaps to overcome. A transitional program which would provide "real-world" experience within the context of a supportive treatment program could better prepare the older student for independent living. Probationfields, for example, has planned a food service facility which would employ advanced students to provide meals to the general public under the supervision of the culinary arts instructors and with the continuation of GGI groups for support.

5. During the course of the evaluation JTPA funding was unexpectedly terminated for one site (Skillman) and CAI instruction threatened by an interruption in funding at a second site (Manor Woods). The issue of funding stability is critical, particularly in view of uncertainties created by the Gramm-Rudman legislation. Options must be explored for the development of alternative sources of funding. This issue is explored in the next section of this report.

6. Each site commented on a need to provide a forum where they could discuss successful strategies for use of the computer and exchange effective software. Many commented that they had purchased a number of software programs which turned out to be unusable for the students, only to hear sometime later that another site had tried similar software with the same results. Such a forum would provide useful information for both new and established programs by reducing the "trial and error" method of funding software and broadening their base of usable successful software.

For example, software targeted toward students with low reading or math skills, and software which provides a frequent "hands-on" interaction between student and terminal, are available but hard to find. Furthermore, many vendors require that a customer purchase the package to fully test it and then allow only a credit refund should the software turn out to be unsatisfactory. One site commented that they had almost $300 in credit from companies whose software was not useful to their program. Providing a time for sites to exchange ideas, experiences and recommendations would eliminate the need for this type of trial and error spending. Software vendors could be invited to demonstrate their products. A

survey might go out to sites, who are using computer-aided instruction currently, to identify vendors and products which they found most useful. Finally, the workshop should include discussion of instructional approaches found to be effective with delinquents.

Issues: Funding and Follow-up

There are several issues unique to the Job Training Partnership Act and its implementation which impact directly on the sites . Through the experience of Skillman and the particular difficulties other sites have had around delays in initial funding; renewal funding; and regulatory problems such as certification; it became apparent that in order to assure additional successful programs these issues must be addressed. The necessary commitment exists. Serious problems have been overcome through the committment and flexibility of the institutions. Also, a strong commitment exists in the service delivery areas to see these programs continue to be successful. This section will describe steps which might be taken to strengthen the likelihood of a successful stable program with JTPA funding.

Due to the flexibility of the federal regulations which mandate, but do not guide the development of a Private Industry Council (PIC) for every service delivery area (SDA) which is responsible for developing local policies, the manner in which JTPA funds are distributed and the structure of the politics will be different for every SDA. For example, in some counties the PIC plays a very active role and its staff is directly responsible for reviewing proposals and administering funds. In other counties, PIC plays an active role, but SDA staff are the key actors. In still other counties, PIC plays a less active role and instead contracts its services to a private agency which reviews proposals and monitors funding. Because the PIC is made

up of local businessmen and politicians each SDA has a unique set of values, ideology and mode of conducting business. Evaluating the actual structural politic of the SDAs is beyond the scope of this evaluation, however in a more focused manner we will discuss the areas which most directly impact on the programs: funding and follow up. Interviews with program staff attracted our attention to these issues. Additional interviews were conducted with SDA/PIC staff who were key actors in the proposal process. In addition we attended PIC meetings and contacted other states and agencies which had conducted similar analyses. Lists of those contacted are included in Appendix A.

Funding

The two most important issues are source and stability.

Source. All six of the programs are funded under 8% Education Set-Aside Funds. Section 123 (a) (1) of the JTPA authorized Governors to provide funds from Title IIA to a state education agency responsible for education and training and to establish criteria for coordinating activities with programs and services provided by state and local education and training programs. These funds amount to eight percent of the total Title IIA allocation of the state.

Section 123 breaks these funds in two smaller parts: eighty percent (6.4 percent of the Title IIA total) are to be used for programs stemming from written cooperative agreements between the state education agency, SDAs and, where appropriate, local education agencies to provide education and job training to eligible participants. The other twenty percent (1.6 percent of the Title IIA total) may be spent on technical assistance, professional development, job placement, counseling, curriculum development, and other indirect activities aimed at coordinating education and job training.

Eight percent funds differ from other JTPA funds in three ways: 1) there are, as of yet, no federal performance standards to be met; 2) twenty-five percent of the participants can be non-economically disadvantaged; 3) the normal 70% cap on training and 15% cap on administration do not apply. These differences give the 8% money the flexibility to translate JTPA rules into a form more effective for educational agencies. Furthermore, they allow the development of programs targeted to participants' needs rather than pre-determined success criteria.

The absense of success criteria, however, does not imply that the programs are not meeting the benchmarks of JTPA. In fact a number of contracts developed between the juvenile sites and the community colleges set specific goals for basic skills achievement and vocational training which meet or exceed the youth competencies established under Title IIA funds for youth. See Appendix F for an example of one of several specific benchmarks established by the Ocean County PIC for the program at Oceanfields.

As a result of the proven ability of these programs to meet the success criteria, some SDA's suggested that, should it be necessary, they would move the project under Title IIA funding. This consideration is the result of discussions in Washington, D.C. regarding the continuation of 8% funds. These could be the first funds to be cut for JTPA because there are no success criteria and thus no way to quickly evaluate effective use of that money. Some 8% cuts have already occurred. One community college reported having $30,000 cut in their 1986 budget; they cut their administrative budget in order to leave service programs intact. However, they felt if there were similar reductions next year they would have to cut into service programs. The same was true for SDA staff. One SDA remarked that even though their 8% budget was drastically reduced for next year, they decided to leave the

funding for the juvenile site program intact but would only commit to one more year of funding.

As mentioned above, originally one SDA planned, if necessary, to fund this program under Title IIA. However, when faced directly with the problem of diminished 8% funds; they refused to move the budget under Title IIA citing their concern with success criteria. In view of the success of these programs in providing significant improvements in basic skills acquisition and behavioral impacts, steps should be taken now to identify other sources to supplement the vulnerable 8% funds and assure program continuity.

Stability. The JTPA programs are operating under three levels of bureaucracy: the PIC/SDA, community college, and juvenile site. There is little formal oversight to assure that renewal funding is timely, that both sides are fulfilling contract goals, that notification of changes in funding or program structure is carried out, or that specific needs of each of the program levels is being met. Without oversight, it is crucial that effective communication lines be established both within the organizations and between them to assure stability of funding.

There are numerous examples of times when lines of communication broke down having varied impacts on the program, some consequences more devastating than others. For example, one SDA reported that their staff needed to collect certain types of statistical information, such as race, age, offense history, etc, to report to PIC. The juvenile site would not release the data citing confidentiality of juvenile records. As a result there arose some question over the ability to renew funding for the program without the requested statistics. The site surrendered the data and re-funding occurred without hesitation.

A further example is the experience of Manor Woods, whose re-funding was delayed for four months while all parties waited for the PIC to vote on renewal funding. The program had officially ended July 30, however the PIC did not meet in August leaving the discussion to occur in September and a vote in November. Meanwhile the computer program continued through the committment of the instructor who was, at that point, no longer being paid. The college did ultimately cover those costs but was forced to do so out of another budget. Had any of those involved been less personally committed to the continuation of such a successful program, the JTPA program would have undoubtedly terminated.

A final example is the actual termination of a program as a result of a lack of oversight or communication. Skillman, which serves boys aged 8 through 17, participated in two JTPA supported programs--the computer aided instruction for those 16 and older and a Twiglight Tech program for those 15 and younger. The PIC decided it would not fund the participation of this site in two programs and shifted the funding support for computer-aided instruction to a local vocational education program. Without having any prior knowledge of this impending decision, Skillman site was informed that their computers would be removed in a week. The computers were ultimately removed four weeks later and the project, as it was funded under JTPA, terminated. As described earlier, Skillman had found the computer aided instruction to be so effective in teaching basic skills that they hired the original instructor and purchased their own computers.

These examples show the strong level of committment which exists to support these programs but further indicate that without total committment from all parties, or an oversight mechanism to ensure funding stability, these unanticipated interruptions often occur.

Most of the SDA's interviewed mentioned that these programs had special needs, but a few mentioned that they did not know in advance what to anticipate or did not have the time to learn about certain needs of offender programs. These programs do differ from other JTPA funded programs in that they are integrated into an ongoing program and participation in the program does not revolve around fiscal year funding. For example, other JTPA programs can be designed to plan the termination of a program to comply with a July 1 funding cycle. A four month lag in funding for one of these programs does not directly affect participants as the agency can plan recruiting periods to coincide with funding cycles. The juvenile sites do not operate in this manner. Because they are continuous on-going programs, at no point could staff plan to end participation in the computer program to wait for refunding.

Suggestions from SDA's for furthering stability of funding committment were:

a) Develop a joint proposal review committee between the Department of Higher Education and the SDA to review proposals from community colleges and juvenile sites. This committee would provide the necessary input from DHE regarding program legitimacy and feasibility along with the SDA staff's knowledge of PIC's funding priorities. This type of committee would aid in the development of an oversight committee for these programs.

b) To avoid delays in funding during the summer one SDA reported that they roll the program automatically over to Title IV summer youth program which assures continuity of funds from July to September.

c) Before the proposal is funded, have all parties meet to discuss particular needs of those involved such as reporting requirements, success criteria, program expectations. A follow-up meeting should occur shortly after implementation to address any issues which had occurred during or after program start-up. These meetings establish strong communication and clasify goals and expectations for program stability.

Programs that held early planning sessions experienced fewer implementation problems. The only exceptions were those where staff turnover lead to replacement of the initial actors. These sites were the ones which reported further problems in renewal funding, altered reporting needs in the middle of the contract, etc.

d) To further awareness of the success of these programs some sites invited PIC to hold their meetings at the juvenile site. Other programs held barbeques, picnics or graduation ceremonies to provide both public awareness and legitimization of the program. All SDA's interviewed mentioned that the positive public usage of these programs was one of the most important benefits to the PIC. Monmouth county staff stressed that Sandy Hook's program was a model for the state. Ocean county said that Oceanfields was one of their most successful JTPA programs with a success rate of over 80%.

Follow-up

There are two critically important types of follow-up activitites which should be initiated by all sites:

1) Personal contact with the student during their transition into the community in order to establish the necessary employment contacts, school notifications, etc.

2) Follow-up research should be conducted to assess program impact through outcome measures such as employment, continuing education, recidivism, etc.

Few sites are doing either type of follow-up on a systematic basis.

Prior research and our own findings indicate the need to develop a strong aftercare component for students discharged from the JTPA sites. A recent review of 555 studies covering more than two million individuals concluded that, for juvenile offenders, supervision after release is one of the most critical factors in averting recidivism: "... juveniles who were released with no supervision...were associated with higher rates of recidivism than juveniles receiving any form of supervision after release." (Genevie et. al; 1986).

The nature of the adjustment required of the discharged student makes the need for aftercare evident. The correctional program is highly structured. The program environment is designed to foster pro-social achievement. Staff are trained to recognize and support even modest academic or vocational progress. The student's peers applaud achievements such as the successful completion of a training course, the awarding of a GED, etc. Counselors and program staff are available to help with bureaucratic red tape and the inevitable frustrations which accompany efforts to reverse a history of poor achievement and overcome the "outsider" self-image. Contrast this with the situation encountered by many releasees upon their return to the community. Adults are too preoccupied with their own struggles to pay much attention to him. When they do, it is often to remind him of his shortcomings and

failures. Law-abiding peers avoid involvement with this "ex-con", leaving him to fight a lonely battle for acceptance or turn to his former delinquent peer group for friendship and belonging. Efforts to involve himself in educational programs, job hunting, etc. are stifled by an astronomical teen unemployment rate, seemingly endless bureaucratic forms, and very limited financial or social resources to help him through this critical life transition stage.

The critical question is not whether aftercare is needed, but the form it should take. Unfortunately, prior research provides little guidance here. Ideally, supervision should be provided during this re-integration period by an individual who has participated in post-release planning for the student; who has an understanding of the boy's strengths and weaknesses; and familiarity with community resources. The supervisor should have a good working relationship with program staff and good rapport with the boy's family. Building upon the treatment model itself, the supervisor should encourage family members to celebrate the student's achievements and accept responsibility for supporting his efforts to "go straight". In conjunction with his family, the supervisor can help the boy to realistically plan for his future and take the first steps necessary to achieve his goals.

This form of supervision need not take the structure of parole. The important aspect of this aftercare is continuity of services and continued support while the student reintegrates into the community. Studies on parole show that these objectives are not often met due to high case loads, rigidity of structure and lack of continuity of care through the assignment of a new parole officer. Instead, studies suggest that the ideal aftercare program includes a structured, flexible, form of support; namely one person or a team of people who see the student at intake, at various points during his stay,

and then assist the student in returning to school, finding employment, etc. upon release. An appropriate model currently exists in New Jersey, however further refinement is needed to develop an effective program.

The position is officially called Teacher II-post release coordinator. It is funded under the Department of Corrections Division of Education. There are currently two positions, one which covers the northern half of New Jersey and the second which covers southern New Jersey.

In this position, the person is responsible for tracking the progress of students in both day and residential programs (17 in Northern New Jersey--11 day programs and 6 residential, for example). They conduct an intake with each student as they come into the program, and work with the staff at each site to document their progress. They also make contact with the parents, where possible, to provide information on the student's progress and elicit any goals the parents might have for the student. Shortly before release they meet again with the student to determine the best placement for him, either continuing in an educational program (high school or college) or employment. The post release coordinator then makes an official 30-day follow-up with the student and documents his progress. Informally, however, they may continue to make contacts up to the 30 day period and beyond.

This model is one which assures continuity of services, provides consistency of care from intake to release, and provides follow-up information valuable for determining the programatic impact and recidivism. The following are recommendations for strengthening this model:

1. Divide New Jersey into three regions: north, central, and south having a post release coordinator responsible for each region. Currently staff can only visit a program once a month due to the large number of programs for which they are responsible.

2. Expand the aftercare staff to two per region.

3. Lengthen the follow-up period to include a 60-90-120 day follow up (and perhaps up to one year) to further evaluate the impact of programs and document what types of post-placements have the most success.

4. Begin to develop a network of support services for students leaving one area and moving to another. Currently post release staff must search to find appropriate programs because they are sometimes unfamiliar with a geographic area. Public and private services alike should be documented and distributed among aftercare workers to expand options for post-placements decisions.

Overcoming bureaucratic requirements during the transition period can be critical to successful re-adjustment to the community. In particular, JTPA certification requirements are particularly burdensome to discharged students who would like to participate in JTPA programs in their home counties. A number of juvenile sites reported that students who successfully complete their program and want to continue in a JTPA program elsewhere in the state have been unable to do so based on the certification requirements. These regulations require that a participant moving from one county to another must be re-certified in order to be eligible to participate in JTPA in the new county. The first time the students applied for eligibility a counselor from the juvenile site assisted them in the process. The second time around, the student may be unable to complete the paperwork because he may not have the required information or be able to understand all of the questions. Continuity of services can be critical, since idleness poses a serious risk of further delinquent involvement. To lose even one of these students because of paperwork is a true failure in the system.

Suggestions for overcoming this barrier include:

1) Developing a new form which lists pertinent information about the student which he can take with him upon completion of the program as a means of introduction in the new county. This form would automatically make him eligible for JTPA programs in the new county without filling out the certification packet.

2) Developing a transfer system throughout the state by which counties can access eligibility certification from other counties. This could be either a computer transfer or by mail record transfer.

3) A more informal solution is a personal contact from the juvenile site to the county JTPA office, to identify a contact person whose name can be provided to the discharged juvenile. Sites doing this have found that it successfully ensures continued participation without the burden of re-certification.

Currently three sites, Oceanfields, Probationfields and Sandy Hook conduct some form of follow-up research on students leaving their program. Probationfields provides after-care and tracking though the probation department. Oceanfields conducts their own internal follow up on students successfully completing their program. two special needs instructors, through DOC, have recently begun developing procedures for an initial contact and short-term follow-up for students leaving selected D.O.C. programs, including Sandy Hook. Ocean county SDA staff plan to begin conducting 30, 60, 90-day follow up for students completing their JTPA programs this July 1. Brookdale Community College attempted a follow-up program but had little success in tracking the students when they moved to other counties.

Developing unified procedures would be most useful for determining the long-term success of these programs. Currently little data is being

collected on a systematic fashion beyond a 6-month follow-up period.

In conclusion we found a strong commitment to the program by correctional administrators and instructors. The program model produced powerful, positive effects in the improvement of basic skills; good work habits; improved attitudes toward learning and employment; and modest but positive behavioral changes. We strongly recommend that the model be continued and further developed through attention to the issues discussed in this report.

APPENDIX A

PERSONS INTERVIEWED FOR THE EVALUATION

I Site Staff

JAMESBURG

Gene Dolnik	Director Educational Programs
Arthur Ruchs	Driver/Counselor
Dan Culinane	Community Ed. Director (Middlesex County College)
John Walton	Vocational Ed. Teacher - warehouse support
Phil Paglese	Vocational Ed. Teacher - warehouse support (electronic)
Anita Vorhees	Dean Community Education
	2 students

MANORWOODS

Gavin Etbert	Staff Counselor
Joe Finley	Saff Instructor
Billy Wilson	Staff Computer Instructor
Don Christiano	Superintendent
Mary Jane Wishart	JTPA Computer Instructor
Damien Kodges	College Coordinator (Atlantic County College)
Denise Price	Liaison Atlantic County College
	2 Students

OCEANFIELDS

Marilyn Lalka	Director/Superintendent/GGI
Bill Bailey	Staff/GGI Instructor
Maryann Richards	Basic Skills Computer Instructor
Dr. Riismandel	College Coordinator (Ocean County College)
	1 student

PROBATIONFIELDS

Tom D'Angelo	Director
Cecil Herbert	Electronics Teacher
Jim Mcbough	Culinary Arts Teacher
Linda Bernstein	Basic Skills Instructor
Stan Vetovich	Employment Counselor
Dominick Palumbo	Staff - GGI w/culinary group
Mike Kealy	Staff - GGI w/electronics group
Frank Falconi	College Coordinator (Passaic County College)

SANDY HOOK

Lenny Watson	Assistant Superintendet
Walt Fleming	Trades Instructor
Ron Fomaino	Trades Instructor
Rich Barlaam	Computer Instructor/ basic skills
Barbara Moore	Basic Skills Instructor
Paul Zigo	College Coordinator (Brookdale Community College)

SKILLMAN

Karen Caviello	Staff - Education
Steve Williams	Computer Instructor
George Yafchak	Superintendent
Todd Richter	Cottage Staff/instructor
Kevin Keefe	Somerset College - College Liaison

II. SERVICE DELIVERY AREA/PRIVATE INDUSTRY COUNCIL STAFF

Jeff Roberts	Atlantic/Cape May SDA staff
Gary Altman	Passaic County PIC staff
Elaine Clandinine	Ocean County SDA staff
Maureen Manning-Clayton	Monmouth County SDA staff

III. ORGANIZATIONS

Public Private Ventures
National Private Industry Council, Laurie Strumpf
National Planning Association
National Alliance of Business
National Commission for Employment Policy - Steve Balduin
National Commission for Employment Policy - Janet Johnston
National Job Training Partnership, Inc.
David Lah - Department of Labor: Federal
Kathy Budd-State Job Coordinating Council New Jersey
Paul Kaleda - Department of Labor New Jersey
Chris Niccols - Interface, Inc.
Department of Corrections New Jersey - Sharon Najim

APPENDIX B

JTPA EVALUATION DATA SHEET

Section 1: Intake

NAME OF STUDENT: _____

1. MONTH OF BIRTH _____ _____

2. YEAR OF BIRTH _____ _____

3. RACE

BLACK = 1 HISPANIC = 3
WHITE = 2 OTHER = 4

_____

4. HEAD OF FAMILY

BOTH PARENTS = 1 RELATIVE = 4
FATHER = 2 GUARDIAN = 5
MOTHER = 3 OTHER = 6

_____

5. MOST SERIOUS OFFENSE FOR WHICH COMMITTED

MURDER 0 ROBBERY = 3 PROPERTY = 6 OTHER = 9
FORCIBLE RAPE 1 BURGLARY = 4 DRUGS = 7
ASSAULT 2 AUTO THEFT= 5 AUTHORITY= 8

_____

6. STATUS OF STUDENT

INMATE = 1
PROBATIONER = 2

_____

7. MONTH ADMITTED TO RESIDENCE _____ _____

8. YEAR ADMITTED TO RESIDENCE _____ _____

9. TYPE OF HOME COMMUNITY

URBAN = 1 RURAL = 3
SUBURBAN = 2 NOT SURE= 4

_____

BASIC SKILLS SCORE (Intake)

10. DATE OF TEST

_____ _____ (Day)

_____ _____ (Month)

_____ _____ (Year)

11. READING SCORE _____ _____ _____

12. MATH SCORE _____ _____ _____

13. LAST GRADE COMPLETED _____ _____

COURT RECORDS

14. AGE AT FIRST OFFENSE _____ _____

15. RECORD OF ASSAULTIVE BEHAVIOR
1 = YES 2 = NO _____

16. PEER ORIENTATION

LONER = 1 PEER INFLUENCED = 2
PEER ORIENTED = 3 _____

17. NUMBER OF PREVIOUS COMMITMENTS TO INSTITUTIONS OR GROUP HOMES (Not to include time in detention awaiting placement) _____

18. APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF MONTHS IN INSTITUTIONS OR GROUP HOMES (Not to include time in detention awaiting placement) _____ _____ _____

Section 2: Discharge

19. MONTH OF DISCHARGE _____ _____

20. YEAR OF DISCHARGE _____ _____

21. MOST LIKELY PLACEMENT AFTER DISCHARGE

1 = WITH FAMILY/RELATIVE
2 = INDEPENDENT LIVING ARRANGEMENT
3 = ANOTHER RESIDENTIAL PROGRAM/INSTITUTION
4 = OTHER _____

22. REASON FOR DISCHARGE

1 = SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF PROGRAM
2 = NOT RETURNED FROM AWOL
3 = WITHDRAWN BY ORDER OF THE COURT
4 = TRANSFER TO ANOTHER FACILITY DUE TO POOR BEHAVIOR
5 = TRANSFER TO ANOTHER FACILITY NOT RELATED TO POOR BEHAVIOR
6 = OTHER _____

BASIC SKILLS SCORE

23. DATE OF TEST

_____ _____ (Day)

_____ _____ (Month)

_____ _____ (Year)

24. READING SCORE _____ _____ _____

25. MATH SCORE _____ _____ _____

26. WAS STUDENT JTPA ELIGIBLE?

1 = YES 2 = NO 3 = NOT SURE _____

27. DID STUDENT PARTICIPATE IN JTPA SUPPORTED ACTIVITIES?

1 = YES 2 = NO _____

28. NUMBER OF WEEKS UNTIL STUDENT WAS DETERMINED JTPA ELIGIBLE

00 = NOT APPLICABLE NOT JTPA STUDENT
01 = IMMEDIATELY ELIGIBLE _____ _____

29. NUMBER OF WEEKS STUDENT PARTICIPATED IN JTPA SUPPORTED ACTIVITIES _____ _____

30. DID THE STUDENT COMPLETED THE VOCATIONAL TRAINING COMPONENT OF THE PROGRAM?

1 = YES 2 = NO _____

31. HOW MANY WEEKS DID THE STUDENT PARTICIPATE IN VOCATIONAL TRAINING? _____ _____

32. HOW EFFECTIVELY DID THE STUDENT USE THE COMPUTER IN LEARNING BASIC SKILLS AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING?

1 = VERY EFFECTIVELY 2 = EFFECTIVELY
3 = SOMEWHAT EFFECTIVELY 4 = INEFFECTIVELY
9 = NOT APPLICABLE, DID NOT USE COMPUTERS

BASIC SKILLS _____

VOCATIONAL TRAINING _____

33. WAS THE COMPUTER AN IMPORTANT MOTIVATING FACTOR IN THE WORK IN THE PROGRAM _____

1 = VERY IMPORTANT 2 = IMPORTANT
3 = SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT 3 = NOT IMPORTANT
9 = NOT APPLICABLE, DID NOT USE COMPUTERS

APPENDIX C: STAFF RATING FORM

STUDENT'S NAME: _____ DATE: _____

STAFF' NAME: _____ TITLE: _____

RATING SCALE

Very Frequently	More than Average	Slightly more than average	Average	Slightly less than average	Much less than average	Rarely or never
7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Compared to most adolescents his age, to what degree does the student...	RATINGS
1. Seek out adults for attention	_____
2. Resist doing what is expected of him	_____
3. Try to boss around or intimidate other students	_____
4. Express anger in a poorly controlled fashion	_____
5. Withdraw from involvement with other students	_____
6. Tease or make fun of other students	_____
7. Act impulsively, without thinking	_____
8. Express depressed or despairing thoughts	_____
9. Hold other students accountable for their behavior	_____
10. Accept responsibility for his own behavior	_____
11. Show respect to adults	_____
12. Try to manipulate or "con" others	_____
13. Apply himself to academic assignments	_____
14. Seem fearful of other students	_____
15. Treat others' property (including program furnishings and equipment) with respect	_____
16. Portray himself as a victim	_____
17. Act guarded or defensive	_____
18. Act "slick" or sneaky; try to get away with things	_____
19. Confront others' negative behavior appropriately	_____
20. Apply himself to vocational training or work assignments	_____
21. Distrust adults	_____
22. Participate in (formal or informal) peer social activities	_____
23. Accept program rules and norms	_____
24. Take it seriously when confronted in GGI	_____
25. Accepts directions from staff.	

APPENDIX D

DISCHARGE RATING FORM

Please use the following scale to rate any changes you have noted since the student was admitted to the program. For example, a student whose self control is excellent would be rated "4" (no change) if his self control had been excellent when he was admitted. However, if his self control were poor at the time of admission, you would rate him "6" to reflect the positive change. For item #2 use "9" to indicate that the student has never exhibited sneaky behavior.

SCALE

Strong Improvement	Improve-ment	Slight improvement	No Change	Slightly Worse	Worse	Much Worse
7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Since his admission to the program, what changes have you noted in the student...

	RATINGS
1. Attitude toward adult authority figures	_____
2. Manipulativeness; "sneakiness" (9- not applicable)	_____
3. Mastery of basic skills	_____
4. Work habits and vocational skills	_____
5. Self esteem or pride	_____
6. Self control	_____
7. Peer relationships	_____
8. Willingness to try hard to improve himself	_____

Using a scale from 1 to 10 with 1= "extremely small liklihood" and 10= "extremely great liklihood", please rate the liklihood that the student will commit future delinquent of criminal acts. _____

APPENDIX E

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

PROGRAM _____

NAME _____

For each statement, circle the response which best fits your opinion.

STATEMENT

A. You can get along fine in this program if you are "slick" and can con the staff.

1= Not true 2= Usually not true 3= Usually true 4= Very true

B. Most students don't confront the toughest students in the group.

1= Not true 2= Usually not true 3= Usually true 4= Very true

C. You can trust the staff to be honest and fair with you.

1= Not true 2= Usually not true 3= Usually true 4= Very true

D. Most students here try to help each other to improve themselves.

1= Not true 2= Usually not true 3= Usually true 4= Very true

E. I liked working with the computers (Skip this question if you didn't use computers)

1= Not true 2= Usually not true 3= Usually true 4= Very true

F. School work here was more interesting than in other schools I have been in.

1= Not true 2= Usually not true 3= Usually true 4= Very true

G. Being in the program will help me to stay out of trouble from now on.

1= Not true 2= Usually not true 3= Usually true 4= Very true

H. The best way to make it in this program is to act big and bad.

1= Not true 2= Usually not true 3= Usually true 4= Very true

I. The things I have learned here will help me to find and keep a good job some day.

1= Not true 2= Usually not true 3= Usually true 4= Very true

J. Most students here learn how to get along with other people better.

1= Not true 2= Usually not true 3= Usually true 4= Very true

For the next three items, circle the response which best fits your opinion.

K. How often were you afraid that another student might hurt you if you didn't do what he wanted?

1 = often
2 = sometimes
3 = rarely
4 = never

L. Overall, did you feel that this program

1 = didn't help you at all

2 = helped some

3 = helped a lot

M. If a close friend or yours got into serious trouble and the judge decided to place him in a program, would you want him to be sent here?

1 = yes

2 = not sure

3 = no

Finally please use the space below to tell us

1) What you <u>liked best</u> about the program

2) What <u>changes</u> you would make if you were the program director

Use the other side of the page if you need more room to write

Ocean County
Private Industry Council

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT COMPETENCY

WORK SHEET

COMPETENCY AREA	COMPETENCY	COMPETENCY INDICATOR	BENCHMARK
Pre-Employment Skills	Job Search Techniques	Job Application	To the satisfaction of the instructor, the participant will demonstrate proficiency in filling out job application forms by completing applications in a neat, complete and correct manner. Participant will receive a minimum of 4 on a scale of one through five, three out of three times rated.

REFERENCES

Berlin, Gordon. "Building a Natural System of Youth Development", Youth Policy, Vol 8, Jan. 1986.

Campbell, D.T. and Stanley, J.C. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research, Chicago: Rand McNally & Co. , 1966.

Darr, et al. "Getting 100% Results from the Eight Percent Education set aside under the Job Training Partnership Act, A Policy Options Report", National Commission for Employment Policy, April 1985.

Genevie, L; Margolies, E; and Muhlin G. "How Effective is Correction Intervention", Social Policy, Winter 1986.

Hahn, Andrew, Lenman, Robert. What Works in Youth Employment Policy, Committe on New American Realities, Natural Planning Association, 1985.

Little, Milton J. et.al. "The Federal Response to Youth Unemployment: Too little for Too Few: A Report on the Effects of the Job Training Partnerships Act on Youth Employment Programs in New York City, 1984". Report by Interface, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Spill, Reck. "A Systems Approach to Youth Employment Competencies", Report Prepared for the Department of Labor by the National Alliance of Business, 1986.

Walker, Gary et.al. "An Independent Sector Assessment of the Job Training Partnership Act: Phase II Initial Implementation", Gurker Walker Associates, 1985.

ERIC Clearinghouse for
Junior Colleges
DEC 22 1988